

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/810,202	03/26/2004	Ho Yong Kang	2013P159	8671	
8791 7:	590 07/27/2006		EXAM	INER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD			VAN ROY, TO	VAN ROY, TOD THOMAS	
SEVENTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGELE	S, CA 90025-1030		2828		

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/810,202	KANG ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner M	Art Unit	
	Tod T. Van Roy	2828	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION IN THE PROPERTY OF THIS COMMUNICATION IN THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	ATION. ly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 №</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	<u>flay 2006</u> . s action is non-final.		
Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under E	nce except for formal matter	·	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 May 2006</u> is/are: a)	· · · · · · ·	•	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	***		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	,	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Apprity documents have been re tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/	mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/810,202

Art Unit: 2828

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The examiner acknowledges the amending of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-12.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The examiner believes that the claims as amended are largely of the same context as the original claims, and as new rejections are being made, has made this action non-final.

Drawings

The drawings as amended are accepted.

Specification

The disclosure is accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Application/Control Number: 10/810,202

Art Unit: 2828

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Link (US 5850409) in view of Asano (US 2002/0009109).

With respect to claims 1 and 7, Link teaches an apparatus for compensating for characteristics of a laser diode so that the laser diode outputs an optical power at a constant level, also functioning as a transmitter with data inputs, the apparatus comprising: an optical output detector which detects an optical power output from the laser diode (fig.1 #MD, A1, RF) and converts the optical power into a voltage (col.3 lines 55-61), a bias current controller (fig.1 APC) which detects the voltage and outputs a first control value corresponding to a difference between the level and a first reference voltage (fig.1 #A2, ground ref), a modulation current controller (fig.1 AMC) which detects the voltage and outputs a second control value corresponding to a difference between the level and a second reference voltage (fig.1 #A3, AMCREF ref), and a laser diode driver that outputs a drive current to the laser diode according to the first and second control values (fig.1 comprised of #'s IBIAS and IMOD). Link does not teach the bias current controller to have a top holder, or the modulation current controller to have a bottom holder, or using the peak value to control the bias current or the bottom value to control the modulation current. As ano teaches a bias and modulation current controlling circuit wherein the bias and modulation controllers use top and bottom holders. Asano does not teach the "top" to be associated with the bias and the "bottom" with the

modulation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the controller of Link with the holders of Asano in order to insure sufficient power difference between "one" and "zero" levels to allow for clear data transmission. In addition it would have been obvious to interchange the top and bottom holders of Asano for incorporation into Link's circuit (giving the bias current controller the top holder and the modulation current controller the bottom holder) due to the inversion of the input to the APC and AMC of Link, wherein the same inverted signal input is not found in Asano (Asano has no inverted input to the APC/AMC, Link has an inverted input to the APC/AMC, therefor the holders must be interchanged).

With respect to claims 2 and 8, Link further teaches an optical/electrical signal converter which converts the optical power output from the laser diode into a current (fig.1 #MD); a trans-impedance amplifier which inverts an output of the optical/electric signal converter and a resister which is in parallel connected to the trans-impedance amplifier and converts the current into a voltage (fig.1 #A1, Rf).

With respect to claims 3-6 and 9-12, Link and Asano teach the laser apparatus as outlined in the rejection to claims 1 and 7, and further teach the top holder (when added) would operate to detect the maximum level from voltage levels output from the optical output detector (inherent), and the APC operates to compare an output of the top holder (when added) with the first reference voltage (fig.1 A2, ground ref) and to output a control value corresponding to a difference between the output and the first reference voltage to the laser diode driver (function of amp, output to Ibias); and a bottom holder (when added) would operate to detect the minimum level from voltage levels output

Art Unit: 2828

from the optical output detector (inherent), and the AMC operates to compare and output of the bottom holder (when added) with the second reference voltage (fig.1 A3, AMCREF) to output a difference between the output and the second reference voltage to the laser diode driver (function of amp, output to Imod).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tod T. Van Roy whose telephone number is (571)272-8447. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minsun Harvey can be reached on (571)272-1835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVR